

REMARKS

Claims 7-17 and 21-22 are withdrawn from consideration, and claims 3 and 4 canceled.

Claims 1 and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Morris.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Morris fails to disclose a white balance adjustment that is performed to a linear signal; and a white balance adjustment and dynamic range adjustment that are performed to natural-logarithmical signals for improving contrast. For example, the claimed invention (claims 1, 2 and 18) requires a second signal processing circuit supplied with the second signal from the solid-state image sensing device and performing white balance adjustment of the second signal, wherein a dynamic range of the second signal is adjusted at the second signal processing circuit thereby a contrast of the second signal is improved. Similarly, Morris fails to disclose a signal processing circuit which performs white balance adjustment of the signal from the sensor and the output signal of logarithmic/linear conversion circuit, nor does Morris disclose a signal processing circuit which performs dynamic range adjustment of the output signal of logarithmic/linear conversion circuit for improving contrast. For example, the claimed invention (claim 18) requires the first predetermined signal processing comprises white balance adjustment of the first signal, and the second predetermined signal processing comprises white balance adjustment of the second signal, and a dynamic range of the second signal is adjusted through the second predetermined signal processing thereby a contrast of the second signal is improved.

Claims 2, 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Morris in view of D'Luna. The rejection to claims 2, 4, and 6 are respectfully traversed for the reasons presented in the arguments above, and for the following reasons. D'Luna also fails to disclose the above-mentioned features.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Morris and D'Luna, further in view of Edwards. The rejection to claim 5 is moot in view of its cancellation.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Morris and D'Luna, further in view of Nakamura. The rejection to claim 3 is moot in view of its cancellation.


In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is

determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772024100. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: August 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


By _____

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 5500

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 887-1525